

Longitudinal Analysis of School Social Work Practice in Wisconsin: Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey – 1998-2007

Nic Dibble, LSSW, CISW
Education Consultant
School Social Work Services

For more information from the School Social Work Practice Guide visit:
http://sspw.dpi.wi.gov/sspw_sswguide

Description

The Wisconsin School Social Work Survey was developed to identify 1) what areas of responsibility Wisconsin school social workers are involved in (e.g., special education, school attendance, alcohol and other drug abuse), and 2) what professional strategies and programs they are using to address these areas of responsibility (e.g., consultation, advocacy, home visits).

There are 36 areas of responsibility on the survey that fall into one or more of the following categories:

- Families
- Disabilities
- School-wide issues (e.g., school climate/environment, resiliency/protective assets, cultural competency/race issues)
- Specific groups (e.g., students with disabilities, truants, dropouts, adjudicated delinquents, school age parents)
- Violence prevention/response
- Discipline/legal issues

There are 37 professional strategies and programs on the survey that fall into one or more of the areas of comprehensive pupil services delivery:

- Assessment, screening, and evaluation
- Individual and small group services for students
- Home-school collaboration
- Classroom instruction
- Collaboration and partnerships with community-based systems
- Services for staff
- Program and resource development, management, and evaluation
- Systems change and policy

The survey asks respondents to estimate the amount of time they spend on each of the items using the following scale:

1. High – indicating involvement at least a few times weekly
2. Medium – indicating involvement at least once weekly
3. Low – indicating involvement at least once monthly
4. Infrequent – indicating involvement less than monthly
5. Not at all

By using this scale (as opposed to some other method, such as asking respondents to estimate the amount of time they spend on each item), respondents are able to complete the survey in minimal time, while still providing some idea of the time devoted to these different issues and services. Time necessary to complete the survey is a critical variable in the response rate.

The survey has historically been administered using a census sample (attempting to make it widely available to as many school social workers in the state as possible) four times in 1998, 2001, 2004, and 2007 by the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) with the important support of the Wisconsin School Social Work Association (WSSWA).

The Wisconsin School Social Work Survey changed little over the first four administrations.

- 1998 – The original survey did not include “infrequent” as a choice to estimate how much time respondents devoted to any given item on the survey. This choice was added to the second survey conducted in 2001-02.
- 2001 – The second survey additionally asked respondents what grade level(s) they were assigned to, choosing from PreK-2, 3-5, 6-8 and 9-12. In addition, “basic human needs” was added as another area of responsibility and “program coordination” was added as another professional strategy and program.
- 2004 – The third survey additionally asked respondents what percentage of time they spent on work related to special education. “Learnfare” was dropped as an area of responsibility.
- 2007 – The fourth survey added “crisis” as an area of responsibility.

See Appendix A for a copy of the survey used in 2007.

Distribution and Response Rates

In 1998, the survey was available in hard-copy only. It was distributed, completed, and returned during meetings of school social workers throughout the 1998-99 school year. A total of 146 school social workers (of 523 Wisconsin school social workers) completed the survey (participation rate of 27.9 percent).

Following the administration of the first survey, DPI gained the capacity to communicate by email with people outside the agency. The state consultant for school social work services created a voluntary email group to disseminate information that may be of interest to school social workers. The 2001 survey was emailed (numerous times throughout the 2001-02 school year) as an attachment to members of the Wisconsin School Social Worker email group. Respondents were responsible for printing, completing, and mailing the completed survey to the

DPI. The 2001 survey had a significantly higher participation (226 of 544 for a participation rate of 41.5 percent), likely due to the electronic dissemination.

The 2004 survey was available in an electronic form only on the DPI's website from September 2004 to February 2005. School social workers learned about the survey through correspondence to two school social work email groups. One group is operated by the WSSWA for members only. The other group is the Wisconsin School Social Worker email group mentioned above. Emails were sent three times over the six month period at approximate two-month intervals to both groups. The survey was also promoted at various school social worker meetings across the state during the first semester of the 2004-05 school year. Between direct emailing and survey participants forwarding emails, it is estimated between 80-90 percent of school social workers in Wisconsin received word about the survey. Survey participation increased once again to 276 of the 535 school social workers in the state (participation rate of 51.6 percent).

The 2007 survey was once again available electronically on the Department of Public Instruction website from September to December, 2007. The survey was marketed in the same manner as the third survey through the school social worker email groups and meetings of school social workers throughout the state. Response rate was once again about half of the school social workers in the state; a total of 272 of the 545 Wisconsin school social workers completed the survey (50.0 percent participation rate).

In 2001, the survey was modified to also ask the respondents the grade levels at which they work. Responses are provided in Table 1 for the 2001, 2004, and 2007 surveys. The total numbers of responses in each year are greater than the total number of respondents, because most school social workers reported working at multiple grade levels.

Table 1. Grade Levels at which Survey Respondents Work

Year	PreK-2		Grades 3-5		Grades 6-8		Grades 9-12	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
2001	139	61.5%	149	65.9%	100	44.2%	92	40.7%
2004	174	63.0%	189	68.5%	131	47.5%	116	42.0%
2007	166	61.0%	188	69.1%	126	46.3%	96	35.3%

There are 427 school districts, 12 Cooperative Educational Services Agencies (CESAs), and four County Children with Disabilities Education Boards (CCDEBs) in Wisconsin. Of those, 108 school districts, three CESAs (that serve multiple school districts) and no CCDEBs employed school social workers. School social workers working in CESAs 2, 5, 7, and 9 contributed proportionally more to the survey sample in 2007 compared to 2004, while school social workers working in CESAs 1 and 12 contributed proportionally less. See Table 2. Data are not available regarding survey response rates by CESA for the first two surveys in 1998 and 2001.

Table 2. Distribution of School Social Workers by CESA in 2007

CESA	No. of Survey Respondents by CESA	Approximate Percent of Sample	Total No. of School Social Workers in CESA	Overall Percent of School Social Workers
1	101	37.7%	263	48.3%
2	75	28.0%	125	22.9%
3	1	0.4%	2	0.4%
4	8	3.0%	14	2.6%
5	12	4.5%	14	2.6%
6	22	8.2%	45	8.3%
7	32	11.9%	49	9.0%
8	3	1.1%	8	1.5%
9	10	3.7%	15	2.8%
10	2	0.7%	5	0.9%
11	2	0.7%	3	0.6%
12	0	0.0%	2	0.4%

This is in some contrast to the survey response in 2004, where school social workers in CESAs 3 and 7 contributed proportionally more to the survey sample, while school social workers in CESAs 2, 5, and 8 contributed proportionally less. See Table 3.

Table 3. Distribution of School Social Workers by CESA in 2004

CESA	No. of Survey Respondents by CESA	Approximate Percent of Sample	Total No. of School Social Workers in CESA	Overall Percent of School Social Workers
1	127	46.0%	243	45.4%
2	54	19.6%	129	24.1%
3	3	1.1%	3	0.6%
4	8	2.9%	14	2.6%
5	5	1.8%	16	3.0%
6	22	7.8%	45	8.4%
7	40	14.5%	48	9.0%
8	4	1.5%	12	2.2%
9	8	2.9%	15	2.8%
10	2	0.7%	5	0.9%
11	2	0.7%	4	0.7%
12	1	0.4%	1	0.2%

Analysis

Weighted aggregate scores were calculated, in order to reflect the overall level of involvement with each of the areas of responsibility and professional strategies and programs. These weighted scores were then used to 1) rank the items from highest to lowest weight (i.e., amount of time devoted to that particular item), and 2) compare changes over time. Weighted scores were calculated in the following manner:

1. Convert each total number of responses to each high, medium, low, and infrequent rating for each item to a percentage.

2. Weight each percentage:
 - a. Multiply each percentage of “high” responses by four.
 - b. Multiply each percentage of “medium” responses by three.
 - c. Multiply each percentage of “low” responses by two.
 - d. Multiply percentages of “infrequent” responses by one.
 - e. Eliminate percentages of “not at all” responses.
3. Add all of the weighted scores for each item to create an aggregate weighted score for each item.

Using this method, the highest possible weighted aggregate score for any single item is 4.00 (i.e., $4 \times 100\% = 4.00$).

Comparisons across the four surveys must take into consideration that the first survey did not give survey participants the option of “infrequent” as a response. Consequently, the weighted aggregate scores in Appendix B comparing all four surveys do not include any of the percentages of “infrequent” responses in the scores and resulting rankings. Appendix C compares the three most recent surveys and does include the calculated percentages from all response categories, including “infrequent.”

Results

What issues are Wisconsin school social workers addressing?

The issues addressed most often by Wisconsin school social workers have remained consistent over the past decade. Table 4 lists the areas of responsibility that were ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the four surveys. For each item, the table lists the rank from the 2007 survey, the average rank for all four surveys, the 2007 aggregate weighted score and the average aggregate weighted score for all four surveys. Because only 12 areas of responsibility have been ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the four surveys, this indicates the issues Wisconsin school social workers address most often has changed little over the past decade.

Table 4. Top Areas of Responsibility – 2007 and averages of all four surveys

Area of Responsibility	2007 Rank	Average Rank	2007 Aggregate Weighted Score	Average Aggregate Weighted Score
Children at risk	1	2.8	3.43	3.40
Attendance, truancy, dropouts	2	2.3	3.41	3.45
Behavior management	3	3.8	3.23	3.29
Special education	4	3.3	3.20	3.35
Basic human needs	5	6.3	3.12	3.05
Conflict resolution, anger management	6	6.8	3.00	3.01
Parent-child relationships	7	4.25	2.97	3.32
Crisis	8	NA	2.96	NA
Family trauma, change	9	6.5	2.93	3.10
Child abuse and neglect	10	9.0	2.51	2.69
School climate and environment	14	11.25	2.17	2.46
Discipline	15	12.3	1.99	2.38

“Basic human needs” was first introduced in the survey as an area of responsibility in 2001 and “crisis” was first introduced in 2007. It is notable that both are ranked in the top 10.

Changes in the amount of time spent and relative emphasis on any given area of responsibility can be monitored by tracking any changes in rank and weighted aggregate scores over time. Based upon those two data sets, Wisconsin school social workers are reporting spending comparatively less time now than in the past in the areas of:

- parent-child relationships,
- family trauma/change,
- school climate and environment, and
- discipline.

However, all four of these areas continue to be major emphases for Wisconsin school social workers compared to most of the other areas of responsibility on the survey.

Appendix B lists all of the areas of responsibility from the survey in alphabetical order, along with their individual ranks and aggregate weighted scores in each of the four surveys. Reviewing these two data sets in Appendix B, Wisconsin school social workers are also reporting spending less time in the areas of:

- alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse,
- inclusion,
- juvenile delinquency,
- school-age parents,
- Section 504 assessment and coordination, and
- W-2 (Wisconsin Works).

In contrast, the time spent on homelessness has grown over the past decade. Additional federal requirements for public schools to serve homeless students, as delineated in the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act, has likely been the impetus for this growth.

What professional strategies and programs are Wisconsin school social workers using to address these issues?

The professional strategies and programs utilized most often by Wisconsin school social workers have remained consistent over the past decade. Table 4 lists the professional strategies and programs that were ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the four surveys. For each item, the table lists the rank from the 2007 survey, the average rank for all four surveys, the 2007 aggregate weighted score and the average aggregate weighted score for all four surveys. Because only 12 different professional strategies and programs have been ranked in the top 10 in at least one of the four surveys, this indicates the professional strategies and programs utilized most often by Wisconsin school social workers has changed little over the past decade. Relative consistency is also demonstrated in rank orders and weighted scores over time.

Table 5. Top Professional Strategies and Programs – 2007 and averages of all surveys

Professional Strategy or Program	2007 Rank	Average Rank	2007 Aggregate Weighted Score	Average Aggregate Weighted Score
Advocacy for students and families	1	1.8	3.47	3.49
Consultation	2	1.3	3.41	3.53
Individual student counseling	3	3.8	3.34	3.33
Referral and information	4	3.3	3.33	3.35
Case management	5	5.5	3.25	3.20
School-home liaison, home visits	6	6.5	3.01	3.09
Crisis intervention, coordination	7	7.8	3.00	2.70
Assessment of students	8	6.5	2.97	3.11
Building consultation team	9	10.0	2.76	2.79
Pupil services teaming	10	11.5	2.76	2.64
Parent conferences	11	9.5	2.56	2.80
School-community liaison	12	10.8	2.43	2.71

Appendix B lists all of the professional strategies and programs from the survey in alphabetical order, along with their individual ranks and aggregate weighted scores in each of the four surveys. Reviewing these two data sets in Appendix B, Wisconsin school social workers are also reporting spending less time on:

- parent conferences,
- parent groups/classes/presentations, and
- supervision of school social work students.

Wisconsin school social workers reported spending more time on:

- alternative school/program, and
- classroom instruction.

How are Wisconsin school social workers involved in systemic activities?

A number of the professional strategies listed in the survey involve activities that bring about systemic change to a school or school-community. School social workers are specifically trained to examine systems and work to make them more responsive to their clients. Because some of these strategies often are lower-frequency activities, it is more descriptive to share how many Wisconsin school social workers are involved, rather than how much time is devoted to them. For each identified activity, the percentage of Wisconsin school social workers indicating any level of involvement is listed for both the 2007 survey and the average of the surveys in 2001, 2004, and 2007. Survey data from 1998 was excluded because the first survey did not include “infrequent” as a choice on the survey. See Appendix C.

Table 6. Wisconsin School Social Worker Involvement in Systemic Activities

Professional Strategy	2007 Survey Percent	Average Percent of All Surveys
Grant-writing/management	47.4%	50.8%
Policy development	71.0%	73.4%
Program development	77.6%	82.1%
Program evaluation	77.6%	78.4%
Research	63.2%	64.9%
School-community collaborative partnerships	90.8%	91.3%
Staff development, training, in-services	84.9%	88.9%

Approximately half of Wisconsin school social workers report some involvement in grant writing. For all other areas, large majorities report being involved in a variety of systemic change activities, although the percentages of school social worker involvement have declined slightly over the past decade.

Recommendations for Further Study and Analysis

1. Schools report significant challenges meeting the needs of students with mental illness. School social workers are trained in mental health issues and are defined in the current federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act as “school-based mental health professionals.” Mental health should be added as an area of responsibility in the next survey as one means of determining to what extent school social workers are providing services in this area.
2. An additional question should be added for respondents to indicate whether they have administrative or union contracts, as this question has been raised over time.
3. Levels of involvement in different areas of responsibility and professional strategies and programs may differ related to what grade level(s) school social workers are assigned to. For instance, the level of involvement for high school-level school social workers with school-age parents is probably significantly higher than it is for school social workers in elementary and middle school. Data should be disaggregated by grade levels (i.e., elementary, middle, and high school) and further analyzed to create a more accurate picture of school social work practice in Wisconsin.
4. The Wisconsin School Social Work Practice Guide should be updated to include resources that address the areas of responsibility and professional strategies and programs used most often by Wisconsin school social workers.
5. Feedback should be gathered from Wisconsin school social workers regarding their use of the guide to help shape future editions to better support school social work practice.

References

Au, Lynn. *2004-05 Wisconsin School Social Work Survey*. Wisconsin School Social Work Practice Guide, October 2006. Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Appendix A

2007 Wisconsin School Social Work Survey

This survey is being administered through the Wisconsin School Social Work Association (WSSWA) and the Department of Public Instruction (DPI). Data will be gathered and compiled to create a state-wide picture of the areas of responsibility assigned to and professional strategies utilized by Wisconsin school social workers. This information will be shared with school social workers, school districts, CESAs, social work graduate programs, and others upon request by WSSWA and DPI as one way to help inform people about the status of school social work in Wisconsin. The information is gathered every three years in order to identify trends over time. Surveys were administered during the 1998-99, 2001-02, and 2004-05 school years.

Please complete this survey only one time this school year.

School District _____ CESA# _____

Check the grade level(s) that most accurately describe the grades you work in:

____ (PreK-2) ____ (3-5) ____ (6-8) ____ (9-12)

Please estimate the percentage of time you spend on special education services and activities: _____

Below is a list of possible areas of responsibility for school social workers. Please indicate your level of involvement in each of them as follows:

H (high) indicating involvement at least a few times weekly;

M (medium) indicating involvement at least once weekly;

L (low) indicating involvement at least once monthly;

I (infrequent) indicating involvement less than monthly; or

N (not at all).

Areas of Responsibility

_____ alcohol, tobacco & other drug abuse	_____ homelessness
_____ anti-victim education/protective behaviors	_____ human growth & development
_____ attendance/truancy/dropouts	_____ inclusion
_____ basic human needs, i.e., housing, food, clothing, health care	_____ juvenile delinquency
_____ behavior management	_____ parent-child relationships
_____ bilingual/bicultural/ESL	_____ pregnancy prevention
_____ child abuse & neglect	_____ resiliency/protective assets
_____ children at risk	_____ safety/violence prevention
_____ comprehensive school health	_____ school age parents
_____ conflict resolution/anger management	_____ school climate & environment
_____ crisis	_____ Section 504 coordination/assessment
_____ cultural competency/race issues	_____ sexual assault prevention
_____ discipline	_____ special education
_____ eating disorders	_____ suicide prevention
_____ family trauma/change	_____ suspension/expulsion
_____ gender issues	_____ transition plans
_____ gifted & talented	_____ wellness
	_____ W-2

2007 Wisconsin School Social Work Survey (continued)

Below is a list of professional strategies or programs often used or participated in by school social workers. Please indicate your use of or participation in each of these as follows:

H (high) indicating involvement at least a few times weekly;

M (medium) indicating involvement at least once weekly;

L (low) indicating involvement at least once monthly;

I (infrequent) indicating involvement less than monthly; or

N (not at all).

Professional Strategies or Programs

_____	advocacy for students/families	_____	policy development
_____	alternative school/program	_____	program coordination
_____	assessment of students	_____	program development
_____	before/after/summer school program	_____	program evaluation
_____	boarding homes	_____	pupil services teaming
_____	building consultation team	_____	referral & information
_____	case work/management	_____	research
_____	classroom instruction	_____	school-community collaborative
_____	consultation	_____	partnerships
_____	crisis intervention/coordination	_____	school-community liaison
_____	employee assistance program	_____	school health services
_____	employee wellness program	_____	school-home liaison/home visits
_____	grant writing/management	_____	screening students
_____	individual student counseling	_____	service learning/community service
_____	intradistrict collaboration	_____	staff development/training/
_____	mentoring program for students	_____	inservices
_____	observations of students	_____	student assistance programs/group
_____	parent conferences	_____	work
_____	parent group/classes/presentations	_____	supervision of school social workers
_____	peer programs, i.e., mediators, helpers, educators, & leaders	_____	supervision of school social work students

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey!

Appendix B - Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey

Areas of Responsibility	2007		2004		2001		1998	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Alcohol, tobacco & other drug abuse	18	1.84	14	2.26	14	2.45	10	2.44
Anti-victim education, protective behaviors	16	1.97	15	2.06	17	2.07	16	1.94
Attendance, truancy, dropouts	2	3.39	1	3.40	2	3.61	4	3.42
Basic human needs	5	3.12	6	3.04	8	2.97	NA	NA
Behavior management	3	3.10	2	3.38	5	3.40	5	3.27
Bilingual, bicultural, ELL	20	1.50	23	1.55	29	1.30	27	1.33
Child abuse and neglect	10	2.42	9	2.62	9	2.85	8	2.89
Children at risk	1	3.41	8	2.85	1	3.67	1	3.66
Comprehensive school health	22	1.42	22	1.61	23	1.71	20	1.49
Conflict resolution, anger management	6	2.98	7	2.99	7	3.14	7	2.92
Crisis	8	2.94	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cultural competency, race issues	17	1.86	19	1.80	19	2.03	17	1.74
Discipline	15	1.99	12	2.42	13	2.59	9	2.51
Eating disorders	32	0.66	32	0.73	33	0.96	32	1.08
Family trauma, change	9	2.91	5	3.16	6	3.20	6	3.17
Gender issues	30	0.90	30	0.99	30	1.29	31	1.10
Gifted and talented	35	0.28	33	0.41	35	0.76	33	0.78
Homelessness	12	2.27	16	2.04	21	1.74	18	1.55
Human growth and development	25	1.14	25	1.24	26	1.54	26	1.35
Inclusion	19	1.56	18	1.90	16	2.30	12	2.31
Juvenile delinquency	18	1.78	17	2.04	15	2.44	15	2.19
Learnfare	NA	NA	34	0.00	34	0.88	34	0.71
Parent-child relationships	7	2.95	4	3.27	4	3.51	2	3.54
Pregnancy prevention	28	0.96	28	1.06	31	1.29	30	1.16
Resiliency, protective assets	11	2.32	11	2.47	11	2.70	14	2.21
Safety, violence prevention	13	2.28	13	2.41	12	2.65	13	2.25
School age parents	29	0.91	29	1.02	28	1.32	23	1.39
School climate and environment	14	2.17	10	2.52	10	2.73	11	2.42
Section 504 assessment and coordination	33	0.64	31	0.98	27	1.48	19	1.51
Sexual assault prevention	31	0.90	27	1.13	32	0.97	29	1.20
Special education	4	3.17	3	3.29	3	3.53	3	3.43
Suicide prevention	23	1.37	20	1.72	21	1.75	21	1.46
Suspension, expulsion	24	1.28	24	1.40	20	1.79	24	1.39
Transition plans	26	1.06	25	1.15	25	1.57	28	1.29
Wellness	21	1.46	21	1.66	18	2.06	25	1.39
W-2	27	1.05	27	1.14	24	1.61	22	1.40

Note: The first survey in 1998-99 did not include "infrequent" as a choice, so the weighted aggregate scores for the second, third, and fourth surveys are calculated without using the percentages of "infrequent" responses.

Appendix B - Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey

Professional Strategies and Programs	2007		2004		2001		1998	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Advocacy for students and families	1	3.46	2	3.66	2	3.50	2	3.36
Alternative school/program	17	1.78	19	1.62	24	1.48	20	1.38
Assessment of students	8	2.95	6	3.24	6	3.19	6	3.05
Before/after/summer school program	28	0.96	27	1.18	29	1.13	28	1.02
Boarding homes	37	0.23	34	0.24	36	0.34	35	0.38
Building consultation team	9	2.71	9	2.95	11	2.74	11	2.75
Case management	5	3.22	5	3.30	5	3.22	7	3.05
Classroom instruction	21	1.50	NA	NA	27	1.30	25	1.23
Consultation	2	3.40	1	3.69	1	3.51	1	3.51
Crisis intervention/coordination	7	2.96	7	3.12	8	2.99	9	2.80
Employee assistance program	35	0.36	36	0.19	35	0.53	32	0.68
Employee Wellness Program	34	0.43	33	0.60	34	0.55	34	0.51
Grant-writing/management	33	0.55	32	0.69	33	0.72	31	0.71
Individual student counseling	4	3.32	4	3.40	3	3.43	4	3.18
Intradistrict collaboration	16	1.81	17	1.77	20	1.71	18	1.49
Mentoring program (for students)	23	1.35	25	1.27	21	1.65	24	1.25
Observations (of students)	13	2.33	13	2.32	14	2.31	14	1.98
Parent conferences	11	2.56	10	2.77	9	2.88	8	3.01
Parent groups/classes/presentations	27	1.15	26	1.22	25	1.50	22	1.30
Peer programs	24	1.26	20	1.60	17	1.83	17	1.53
Policy development	29	0.81	28	1.06	30	1.04	29	0.92
Program coordination	18	1.74	16	1.88	16	2.06	NA	NA
Program development	20	1.62	18	1.67	22	1.54	16	1.73
Program evaluation	22	1.46	21	1.48	26	1.44	26	1.19
Pupil services teaming	10	2.71	12	2.61	12	2.60	12	2.66
Referral and information	3	3.32	3	3.46	4	3.40	3	3.24
Research	31	0.77	30	0.74	32	0.88	33	0.58
School-community collaborative partnerships	14	2.18	14	2.28	13	2.32	13	2.04
School-community liaison	12	2.43	11	2.76	10	2.85	10	2.78
School health services	25	1.22	24	1.37	19	1.76	23	1.30
School-home liaison, home visits	6	2.96	8	3.07	7	3.17	5	3.14
Screening students	19	1.64	23	1.43	18	1.77	19	1.42
Service learning, community service	30	0.80	29	0.93	28	1.29	30	0.80
Staff development, training, in-services	26	1.20	22	1.44	23	1.54	21	1.40
Student assistance programs, group work	15	1.87	15	2.14	15	2.29	15	1.76
Supervision of school social workers	36	0.24	35	0.22	37	0.20	36	0.38
Supervision of school social work students	32	0.61	31	0.70	31	0.93	27	1.07

Note: The first survey in 1998-99 did not include "infrequent" as a choice, so the weighted aggregate scores for the second, third, and fourth surveys are calculated without using the percentages of "infrequent" responses.

Appendix C - Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey

Areas of Responsibility	2007		2004		2001	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Alcohol, tobacco & other drug abuse	18	2.07	14	2.42	14	2.60
Anti-victim education, protective behaviors	15	2.16	16	2.27	18	2.24
Attendance, truancy, dropouts	2	3.41	1	3.44	2	3.63
Basic human needs	5	3.12	6	3.08	8	3.04
Behavior management	3	3.23	2	3.41	5	3.44
Bilingual, bicultural, ELL	23	1.72	22	1.83	30	1.53
Child abuse and neglect	10	2.51	9	2.69	9	2.90
Children at risk	1	3.43	8	2.95	1	3.68
Comprehensive school health	22	1.72	21	1.89	23	1.89
Conflict resolution, anger management	6	3.00	7	3.04	7	3.20
Crisis	8	2.96	NA	NA	NA	NA
Cultural competency, race issues	17	2.10	16	2.08	17	2.24
Discipline	16	2.13	12	2.56	13	2.69
Eating disorders	3	1.07	31	1.22	32	1.30
Family trauma, change	9	2.93	5	3.19	6	3.23
Gender issues	29	1.29	27	1.40	29	1.58
Gifted and talented	35	0.69	32	0.89	35	1.05
Homelessness	12	2.42	15	2.28	21	2.01
Human growth and development	26	1.49	24	1.60	25	1.83
Inclusion	20	1.82	18	2.06	16	2.43
Juvenile delinquency	19	1.99	17	2.21	15	2.56
Learnfare	NA	NA	NA	NA	34	1.09
Parent-child relationships	7	2.97	4	3.31	4	3.53
Pregnancy prevention	31	1.20	28	1.37	28	1.58
Resiliency, protective assets	11	2.44	11	2.61	11	2.79
Safety, violence prevention	13	2.4	13	2.54	12	2.75
School age parents	32	1.13	30	1.27	31	1.50
School climate and environment	14	2.33	10	2.65	10	2.81
Section 504 assessment and coordination	34	1.00	29	1.36	27	1.75
Sexual assault prevention	30	1.27	27	1.47	33	1.24
Special education	4	3.20	3	3.34	3	3.56
Suicide prevention	24	1.66	19	1.99	20	2.01
Suspension, expulsion	25	1.61	23	1.72	22	2.01
Transition plans	28	1.37	25	1.5	26	1.80
Wellness	21	1.74	20	1.92	19	2.19
W-2	27	1.39	26	1.50	24	1.85

For each of the items above, survey respondents were given the choices of high (at least a few times weekly), medium (at least once weekly), low (at least once monthly), infrequent (less than once monthly), or not at all. Weighted aggregate scores were calculated in the following manner in order to reflect the overall level of involvement in each of the areas of responsibility listed above:

1. Convert the number of responses in each category for each item to percentages.
2. Weight each percentage:
 - a. Multiply percentages of “high” responses by four.
 - b. Multiply percentages of “medium” responses by three.
 - c. Multiply percentages of “low” responses by two.
 - d. Multiply percentages of “infrequent” responses by one.
 - e. Eliminate percentages of “not at all” responses.
3. Add weighted scores for each category for each item to find the aggregate weighted score.

Note: The first survey in 1998 did not include “infrequent” as a choice, so is not included in this comparison chart.

Appendix C - Wisconsin School Social Worker Survey

Professional Strategies and Programs	2007		2004		2001	
	Rank	Score	Rank	Score	Rank	Score
Advocacy for students and families	1	3.47	2	3.67	2	3.51
Alternative school/program	16	2.02	19	1.87	24	1.72
Assessment of students	8	2.97	6	3.26	6	3.23
Before/after/summer school program	28	1.29	27	1.47	29	1.39
Boarding homes	36	0.43	35	0.49	36	0.51
Building consultation team	9	2.76	9	3.01	11	2.80
Case management	5	3.25	5	3.33	5	3.24
Classroom instruction	21	1.73	NA	NA	28	1.52
Consultation	2	3.41	1	3.69	1	3.51
Crisis intervention/coordination	7	3.00	7	3.17	8	3.04
Employee assistance program	35	0.59	34	0.73	35	0.69
Employee wellness program	34	0.67	33	0.83	34	0.71
Grant writing/management	32	0.82	31	0.97	33	0.93
Individual student counseling	3	3.34	4	3.42	3	3.45
Intradistrict collaboration	17	1.97	17	2.02	20	1.86
Mentoring program (for students)	23	1.58	25	1.54	22	1.79
Observations (of students)	13	2.46	13	2.47	14	2.42
Parent conferences	11	2.62	11	2.86	9	2.95
Parent groups/classes/presentations	27	1.47	26	1.53	23	1.77
Peer programs	25	1.54	20	1.83	17	2.03
Policy development	29	1.18	28	1.40	30	1.33
Program coordination	18	1.93	16	2.11	16	2.19
Program development	20	1.81	18	1.93	25	1.70
Program evaluation	22	1.70	22	1.79	26	1.66
Pupil services teaming	10	2.76	12	2.73	12	2.66
Referral and information	4	3.33	3	3.47	4	3.40
Research	31	1.09	30	1.10	31	1.11
School-community collaborative partnerships	14	2.35	14	2.43	13	2.44
School-community liaison	12	2.54	10	2.87	10	2.91
School health services	26	1.52	24	1.71	19	1.95
School-home liaison, home visits	6	3.01	8	3.15	7	3.22
Screening students	19	1.85	23	1.73	18	1.95
Service learning, community service	30	1.11	29	1.26	27	1.52
Staff development, training, in-services	24	1.54	21	1.79	21	1.83
Student assistance programs, group work	15	2.03	15	2.29	15	2.40
Supervision of school social workers	37	0.33	36	0.30	37	0.27
Supervision of school social work students	33	0.75	32	0.92	32	1.06

For each of the items above, survey respondents were given the choices of high (at least a few times weekly), medium (at least once weekly), low (at least once monthly), infrequent (less than once monthly), or not at all. Weighted aggregate scores were calculated in the following manner in order to reflect the overall level of involvement in each of the areas of responsibility listed above:

1. Convert the number of responses in each category for each item to percentages.
2. Weight each percentage:
 - a. Multiply percentages of “high” responses by four.
 - b. Multiply percentages of “medium” responses by three.
 - c. Multiply percentages of “low” responses by two.
 - d. Multiply percentages of “infrequent” responses by one.
 - e. Eliminate percentages of “not at all” responses.
3. Add weighted scores for each category for each item to find the aggregate weighted score.

Note: The first survey in 1998 did not include “infrequent” as a choice, so is not included in this comparison chart.